



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,129	05/29/2001	Akiyuki Yoshisato	9281-4101	6504

7590 11/02/2004  
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
N B C BLDG., 36TH FLOOR  
455 N. CITYFRONT PLAZA DR.  
CHICAGO, IL 60611

EXAMINER
----------

GRAYBILL, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2822

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/870,129

Applicant(s)

YOSHISATO ET AL.

Examiner

David E Graybill

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 and 15-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 15-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

The reply filed on 8-11-4 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because it fails to conform to the provisions of MPEP 714.03:

37 CFR 1.111. Reply by applicant or patent owner to a non-final Office action.

(b) In order to be entitled to reconsideration or further examination, the applicant or patent owner must reply to the Office action. The reply by the applicant or patent owner must be reduced to a writing which distinctly and specifically points out the supposed errors in the examiner's action and must reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action. The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. If the reply is with respect to an application, a request may be made that objections or requirements as to form not necessary to further consideration of the claims be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated. The applicant's or patent owner's reply must appear throughout to be a bona fide attempt to advance the application or the reexamination proceeding to final action. A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section.

(c) In amending in reply to a rejection of claims in an application or patent under reexamination, the applicant or patent owner must clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. The applicant or patent owner must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Where a bona fide response to an examiner's action is filed before the expiration of a permissible period, but through an apparent oversight or inadvertence some point necessary to a complete response has been omitted - such as an amendment or argument as to one or two of several claims involved or signature to the amendment - the examiner, as soon as he or she notes the omission, should require the applicant to complete his or her response within a specified time limit (usually one month) if the period for response has already expired or insufficient time is left to take action before the expiration of the period. If this is done the application should not be held abandoned even though the prescribed period has expired.

Specifically, applicant failed to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and to show how the amendments avoid the references.

Because the response appears to be bona fide, but through an apparent oversight or inadvertence the response is incomplete, and in order to continue to afford applicant the benefit of compact prosecution, the requirement to complete the response within a one month time limit is waived, the amendment is entered, and the claims are examined on the merits.

In the rejections infra, generally, reference labels are recited only for the first recitation of identical claim elements.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Haq (6146743), Arai (6410960) and Shahani (6028990).

At column 9, lines 45-51 and 56-63, column 21, lines 1-21, and column 22, lines 32-28 and 41-45, Haq discloses an electronic circuit unit comprising: an alumina substrate 50; thin film circuit elements (not labeled) including capacitors, resistors, and inductance elements formed on the alumina substrate; thin film conducting patterns "conductors" and 70, 72 connected to the circuit elements formed on the alumina substrate; a semiconductor chip mounted on the alumina substrate and wire bonded to the conducting pattern "wire bonding of surface mount components"; a ground conducting pattern "conductors" and 70, 72 formed on and at least partially covering the alumina substrate; wherein at least one of the capacitors is a ground capacitor formed on the ground conducting pattern.

Although Haq does not appear to explicitly disclose a ground conducting pattern or a ground capacitor, the limitation, "ground" is a statement of intended use of the conducting pattern and capacitor that does not result in a structural difference between the claimed conducting pattern and capacitor and the conducting pattern and capacitor of Haq. Further,

because the conducting pattern and capacitor of Haq has the same structure as the claimed product, it is inherently capable of being used for the intended use, and the statement of intended use does not patentably distinguish the claimed conducting pattern and capacitor from the conducting pattern and capacitor of Haq. The manner in which a product operates is not germane to the issue of patentability of the product; Ex parte Wikdahl 10 USPQ 2d 1546, 1548 (BPAI 1989); Ex parte McCullough 7 USPQ 2d 1889, 1891 (BPAI 1988); In re Finsterwalder 168 USPQ 530 (CCPA 1971); In re Casey 152 USPQ 235, 238 (CCPA 1967). Also, "Expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim."; Ex parte Thibault, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969). And, "Inclusion of material or article worked upon by a structure being claimed does not impart patentability to the claims."; In re Young, 25 USPQ 69 (CCPA 1935) (as restated in In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963)). And, claims directed to product must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In re Danley, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "Apparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does [or is intended to do]." Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Also, Haq does not appear to explicitly teach the particular claimed capacitor shape. Notwithstanding, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice bounded by well known manufacturing constraints and ascertainable by routine experimentation and optimization to choose this particular shape because applicant has not disclosed that the shape is for a particular unobvious purpose, produces an unexpected result, or is otherwise critical, and it appears prima facie that the process would possess utility using another shape. Indeed, it has been held that mere dimensional limitations are prima facie obvious absent a disclosure that the limitations are for a particular unobvious purpose, produce an unexpected result, or are otherwise critical. See, for example, *In re Rose*, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955); *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984); *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

In addition, Haq does not appear to explicitly disclose a bare chip.

Nonetheless, at column 1, lines 61-67, Arai discloses a bare chip 204. In addition, it would have been obvious to combine the disclosure of Arai with the disclosure of Haq because it would provide the chip of Haq.

Haq also does not appear to explicitly disclose wherein the capacitor is comprised of an upper electrode disposed on a surface of a dielectric

material, the dielectric material is formed on the conducting pattern, and a perimeter of the upper electrode is a polygon with greater than four sides; wherein the perimeter has six sides and interior angles which are one of 90 degrees and 270 degrees.

Nonetheless, at column 3, line 53 to column 4, line 57; column 7, lines 23-32, and 56-58; column 9, lines 17-26; and column 10, lines 10-23, Shahani discloses wherein the capacitor 700 is comprised of an upper electrode 702 disposed on a surface of a dielectric material, the dielectric material is formed on a conducting pattern "metal layers," and a perimeter of the upper electrode is a polygon with greater than four sides; wherein the perimeter has six sides and interior angles which are one of 90 degrees and 270 degrees. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine the product of Shahani with the product of the applied prior art because, as disclosed by Shahani, it would provide a high capacitance per unit area, and it would match spaces left open by other sections of the circuit and efficiently use the area of the chip.

In any case, Shahani discloses that capacitor shape is a result effective variable. Hence, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice bounded by well known manufacturing constraints and ascertainable by routine experimentation and optimization to choose these particular dimensions because applicant has not disclosed that, in view of the applied



prior art, the dimensions are for a particular unobvious purpose, produce an unexpected result, or are otherwise critical, and it appears prima facie that the process would possess utility using another dimension. Indeed, it has been held that mere dimensional limitations are prima facie obvious absent a disclosure that the limitations are for a particular unobvious purpose, produce an unexpected result, or are otherwise critical. See, for example, *In re Rose*, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955); *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984); *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Haq, Arai and Shahani as applied to claim 15, and further in combination with applicant's admitted prior art.

The combination of Haq, Arai and Shahani does not appear to explicitly disclose wherein a part of the ground conducting pattern serves as one electrode of a plurality of capacitors.

Regardless, in the "Description of the Related Art" applicant admits as prior art wherein a part of the ground conducting pattern serves as one electrode of a plurality of capacitors. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine this conventional disclosure with the disclosure of the applied prior art because it would provide ground capacitance.

To further clarify the disclosure of a plurality of capacitors, as cited, applicant admits as conventional "a capacitor," and, it is well settled that the term "a" or "an" ordinarily means "one or more." Tate Access Floors, Inc., and Tate Access Floors Leasing, Inc., v. Interface Architectural Resources, Inc., 279 F.3d 1357; 2002 U.S. App. LEXIS 1924; 61 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1647 ((citing Tate Access Floors, Inc. v. Maxcess Techs., Inc, 222 F.3d 958, 966 n.4, 55 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1513, 1518 [\*\*32] (citing Elkay Mfg. Co. v. Ebco Mfg. Co., 192 F.3d 973, 977, 52 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1109, 1112 (Fed. Cir. 1999))).

Claims 5-8 are allowed.

As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).

Applicant's amendment and remarks filed on 8-11-4 have been fully considered and are addressed by the rejections supra.

**For information on the status of this application applicant should check PAIR:** Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


**Alternatively, applicant may contact the File Information Unit at (703) 308-2733. Telephone status inquiries should not be directed to the examiner. See MPEP 1730VIC, MPEP 203.08 and MPEP 102.**

Art Unit: 2822

Any other telephone inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. Graybill at (571) 272-1930. Regular office hours:

Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

The fax phone number for group 2800 is (703) 872-9306.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. E. Graybill', is positioned above the printed name.

David E. Graybill  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2827

D.G.

28-Oct-04